App. F. 1X-4

1924. (Mugrai)

File No. 3-24

Serial Nos. 1-4

*Previous References*

Mug 94-13-1-4
" " 5-13

*Later References*

Mug 266-26-1-2
Law Dep 137-32
Mug 341-5/4-1-4
4-37-32

# General and Revenue Secretariat.

*Serial Nos.* 4

**Part B for** January 1927

**SUBJECT**

Petition from one Rajanna of Mugurala Village in the matter of the Apl's claim to the Chattram building at Mugurala.

RE 1275 dated 19.1.27

To the Petitioner

Govt do not see any reason to interfere in the matter

(1)

G. R S. 11] 1924-25.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Munzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 3-24.

FILE HEADING.

Appeal petition of Rajanna alias Anantaramaiah of Mungunda village, Gadiganahalli village Hoskote Taluk.

From

The petitioner Rajanna alias Anantaramaiah.

No. Appeal. Dated 3.7.24. Received 4.7.24.

| Diary No. 20 | Enclos. 2 | Spare Copies. | Serial No. 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeal under Section 22 of the Mysore Rent Act against the Munzrai Commr's order No. R.D.D.174 of 23-24 d. 16.6.24 confirming the order of the D.C. Bangalore prohibiting the appellant from erecting a compound wall around the thatched and ordering him within if the appellant was in possession of the building.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1 The appeal petition is duly stamped & is in time.

2 The previous files (Munz. 94-13) are put up for perusal. The correspondence was transferred to the Munzrai Commr with this office letter No. 1591/Munz. 69-22-15 d. 24.10.22. It will be seen from page 13 of the notes (N.11) that the D.C Commr

NOTES—First Sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

20

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 3 of 1924.

Serial No.

01

was informed in this office letter No. 2243/ Muz. 94-19-11 d. 4. 11. 21 that the Chattram was built out of public subscriptions and that as such it could not become the private property of Bhaskaraiah (father of the appellant) & his descendants and requesting him to take further needful action & report the result to Govt. The papers were subsequently transferred to the Muzrai Commissioner. A copy of the Muzrai Comm^r's order appealed against is also enclosed.

17/

Under the orders as to whether the appeal petition may be forwarded to the Muzrai Comm^r for early report & whether he may be requested to issue an immediate stay order pending final disposal of the present appeal.

SRR.
5.7.24.

SRR 7/7

Rec'd Secy

3) It is doubtful if the institution can be considered to be a Muzrai Inst^n as defined in the Muz Regn & if Govt can do anything under it. A stay order may be given pending receipt of the records called for

Records

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

NOTE—Contn. sheet

20/7 8/7

G. R. S. III. 2]

| Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. | of 192 | (3 |
|---|---|---|---|

Serial No

6

D(Ho. Submit-

10.7.24.

7 issue

11.7.24.

2 To the Muzrai Commr. No. 52 d. 12.7.24. Fy. the above petition for Sanction & a report with connected records.

3. To the petitioner Anantanarayana. No. 53 d. 12.7.24. Informs him of the above and states that no stay order can be granted as prayed for in the petition.

4. From the Insp. Conr. Letter no. C. 99 dy 17.10.24. Submits report called for in Sl. 3.

8 The Insp. Conr. reports that as the object of building the chathram on land acquired for public purpose was for the benefit of the temple -

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0561 -GPB- 3750—1 8 22

& Insp. Conr.

Serial No.

The apltt's. contention that the chatham does not come under the definition of muzumdar is untenable, and adds that by allowing the construction of the compound wall, the processions of both the Hindus and mahomedans, and the connection of the village cattle on the land, will be inconvenienced.

9 A copy of the Dy. Comr's. letter refd. to in the Muz. Comr's. letter has not been received.

10 dosa Seen Girdhari

11 Before posting the case for hearing as ordered by the member in para 6 supra, may a copy of the Dy. Comrs. letter also be called for?

12 Submit. for orders.

AL 28-10-24. DL 28/10

13 In orders as to Mat-date the Case may be posted for hearing

DL 23 10 24.

14 2nd member).

15 May be posted to Saturday 29th Nov

DL 29 VI

NOTE—Contd. Sheet

406 25 W

90

29.10.24.

S. III 2]

5

File No of 19 24 | General Se

Serial No.

17

Dft. notices Subsr.

AV
30-8-24.

30/8/24

Issue
30 10 24

Notice Served on the Party

16

27.11.24.

Appellant present in the Record.

Mr B-Narayanda on the adjournment has
prayed adjournment as per ... only for an
adjt on the ground that the present
engagement
is urgent for attending some function

Adjd. Dated. 23rd or
to
2/12/24

20

Parties absent - notices not returned
Served.

10.1.25.

21

Dft. notices Subsr

AV
1.12.24

2 Issue
1.12.24.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

V — The Respondent-in the Mugavoda chathram Case has come here. The parties have not received the notices & so they did not come for the hearing today.

23 This may be kept Come here to find out when the case will come off for hearing.

24 This may be kept brought to the notice of the Member. ~~of the Board~~

~~Enlarged~~ 25th If the case is not ready the Asst. Sale will have to be intimated to the parties by the next notices

fresh notices

P. A to 2? Member with Engrs

by R.S. 10.11.

N. B. — Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

G. R. S. III—3]

7

## ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, reports, etc., not intended for permanent record.

27

Case may be heard on
16th March: and
from notice must
be served

8/2/25

28

11/2/25

29

D.D. notices sent.

11/2/25

26/2/25

11/2/25

30

Draft Tenancy Agreement
for Mr B Nandakumar for approval
and if approved for perusal
Lawyers for engrossment

25th April

23/3/25

the notes must be typed, or slips pasted on
this form

23/3/25

Case called
Parties present with
Lawyers - Heard
both sides
Order reserved

28/4/25

General and Revenue Secretariat

Vol. 3

File No. 3 of 1911

Serial No.

33 I shall have to have recourse to my right to the records whether the charters in question are in the possession of the applicants or of this Complex authorities when he can produce his order and appear. If the suit was in possession of this building, what is the process of law under which his eviction was ordered of the D.C. The only provision that may apply to a case of unauthorised alienation of property belongs to religious and charitable institutions is Sec 10 of the Bengal Act. The procedure prescribed in this section does not seem to have been followed in the case

29/3

23/3 23/3

NOTE—Contn Sheet

G.R.S. III-21

File No. of 19 .

General and R
Secretari

| Serial No. |
| --- |
| |

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No

3 The records were looked into. There is no clear information as to whether the chattram in question was in the possession of the temple authorities at the time of the Dy. Comrs. order in 1922. Slo 5–13 of 1924–13 which may throw light on the point have been transferred to the H. C.

? May a report be called for on the point?

Submitted for orders.

A
3.4.1926. 5/4/26 Refce:- Members orders on the previous page.

If approved, a report will be called for, on the point.

Rev. Secty

5/4

(Sd) (Sd. Member)

7/4

2nd 7.4

9 Draft letter on the lines of my note may be put up for my approval

7/4

8/4

10 D/F- submitted for approval.

A
9.4.26. 9/4/26 11 Rev. Secty

10/4

(Sd) (Sd. Member) 14/4

14.4

Note— Contn. Sheet

P

Pg 6.

uring the hearing
the case, the Pleader
ed that this point
ginated in his
ssertion etc.

450 10

WD 01264—GPB—40,000 -17-12-25

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat | Judl. File No 3 of 1924.

| Serial No. | |
|---|---|
| 5 | To Mus Commr. No 1332 dt 19.4.26. Calls for further infn in the matter. |
| 6. | From, The Judl. Commr. Letter no. C. 77 dt 7-5-26. Submits further report called for in Sl. 5. WB As regards the queries raised in Sl. 5, there is no clear information as to whether the chattram in question was in the possession of the petr or temple authorities when the Dy. Commr passed his order under appeal. (A copy of the Dy. Commr's letter dt 3-5-26 refd to in the Judl C's letter has not been received). |
| Sl. 11 in Judl. P. no. 94-13 D | 4) As regards S.O. dt 4-11-1921 which negatived the rights of Bhaskariah over the institution it will be seen that the correspondence leading to this order was transferred to the Judl. Commr, and if considered, the correspondence will be called for from the Judl. Commr. |
| (KP) | 5) Submit for orders. AV 11.5.26. 11.5.26 |
| | 6) Repn:- Memo's orders: (Para 1) allowed. 4) On the point as to who was in possn, whether the appellant |

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No. A

or the Temple authorities, at the time of the D.C's order, there is no information furnished, in the M.C's letter received in reply. There is no copy of the D.C's letter either, ~~forwarded~~ sent. ~~Definite information~~ This may be pointed out, & definite information called for.

Re the provision of law for the eviction :- It is stated that the eviction order appears to have been passed under the rules laid down in Appendix G, L.R. Rules, though the case also falls under sec 11 of the Mutt. Regn. It is stated that the eviction order was passed in pursuance of G.O of 4th Nov 1921 (R E- a copy is in the file). The correspondence, leading to this, was transferred to the Mutt. Commr., for disposal. If approved, this correspondence will be called for.

Rev. Secy

11/5.

(H P)

B

A The D.C's order of 23rd Nov 1921 ~~finally~~ as follows:- Hy E

'If Ranganna is in poss, the Chairman be advised to evict him and the matter reported thereafter'.

The M.C may be requested to state whether Ranganna was, when the time for giving notice, the individual duly in

| Serial No. | |
|---|---|

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

| Serial No. | |
|---|---|
| | possession & whether he was actually under ~~Cocanada~~ Nuzvid authority. |
| | (500) R. The previous record may also be called for in this — |
| AV 13/5 | 12/5 12/5 |
| | Dft Submitted. AV 14.5.26. 15/5/26 15/5/26 |
| 7 | To Revn Commr R° 14844 dt 22-5-26 Invites ref to D's order of 23.11.25 & Calls for further particulars in the matter. |
| 8 | From, The Inspr Comm Letter no C. 77 dt 27.10.26. — Submits the report called for in Sl. 7. With reference to the Secty's query in para 4 of the office-note it is reported that Rajanna alias Ananda Ramiah has all along been in wrongful possession and that auction pro. did not make further progress than the service of the notice on the party concerned. The records ref. to in para |

NOTE—Contn S/

| Serial No. |
| --- |
| |

NOTE—Contin Sheet

(13

520

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 3 of 192

Serial No.

have been received.
Submitd. for orders with ref. to the
Calr member's minutes in para
33 of the office-note

AV
28/10/26.

I am sorry I could not study this file earlier
(56) The chattram allens to have been in the possession
of the appellant all along. The last order
of Govt that it shd be taken out of his possession
has not been given effect to. In the meanwhile
the appellant has requested for permission
to build a compound wall. ~~All these~~
There are two courses open now ~~is~~ One is to examine
the previous order and see if it shd
be enforced. ~~and~~ If it is decided to
modify it ~~this~~ ~~the~~ may be done and the
appellant left to build a compound
wall or not as he likes. The other course
is to say that the previous order shd
be given effect to - in which case the
permission to build a compound wall
cannot be given. Please put up a
clear memo of the facts of the case
for the orders of the Member

MG
10/11

Agtm

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 3 of 192

Serial No.

87 There is a chattram built by one Anantaramiah at mugumala, Hoskoti Taluk by the side of the Veerabhadra Devaru temple. The apty Rajanna alias Anantaramiah claims the building as his private property (as having been built by his ancestor Bhaskariah for the Anantaramiah) and prays for permission to construct a compound wall to the chattram. The devotees of Veerabhadra Devaru temple object to it on the ground that the chattram should be viewed as the adjunct of the temple, that Rajanna has appropriated it for his own use by storing Ragi and Paddy, and that by allowing the construction of the Compound wall, will inconvenience the processions of both Hindus and Mahomedans of the village, and the cattle of the village cattle on the land. ~~will be inconvenienced~~. The matter came up before for-t in 1921 when it was found that the land on which the chattram stands belonged originally to one Budan Sabi, that it was acquired by local Hirers, and given to Bhaskariah for the construction of a Musafirkhana and that the

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 3 of 192[illegible]

Serial No.

Musafirkhana was built out of public subscription and consequently Bhaskariah's descendants can have no private rights over the site, and ~~Directed~~ the Dy. Comr. was directed to take ~~Needful~~ action in the matter and report the result (Vide Letter no. 2243/Mis 94-13 dt 4-11-1921). In pursuance of this order, the Dy. Comr. issued instructions to the effect that Bhaskariah's son Rajanna should not be allowed to erect the compound wall ~~for the Chattram~~ that the management of ~~which~~ Here Chattram should be left in the hands of the Dharmadarsi of the temple, and that Rajanna should at once be evicted if he was in possession. Against the D.C's order, Rajanna appealed to the Mis. Comr. for relief, and that officer declined to re-investigate the question of the private ownership of the plot without specific orders of Govt. - (Vide M.C's order dt 16.6.22) Against this order, Rajanna has appealed to Govt. - Mysore is a party in the previous pages of the file. The previous member of council heard this appeal and called for further information (Vide para 3?

D

Ques 4

P1

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

containing the member's minutes), and M.C's further report has been received. It is stated that the eviction order was passed by the Dy. Comr. under the Rules laid down in Appendix G, L.R. Rules, though the case also falls under Sec. 11 of the Inam. Regn. As regards the question whether the chattram was in the possession of the pete or the temple authorities when the Dy. Comr. passed his order of eviction, it is reported that Rajanna alias Ananta Ramiah has all along been in wrongful possession and that eviction proceedings did not ~~take further~~ further than the service of the notice on the party concerned.

Submitted for orders.

A1
28.11.26 36
36

30.11.26

61) Subd with reference to paras 33 & 39 (The previous first Members minutes). The facts of the case are summarised in paras 57 & 58 above. The Chattram has been held to belong to the temple. Rajanna says it is his private property. He seems to have been in possession all this time and the

Serial No.

order that he should be evicted has not been given effect. He now requests permission to put up a compound wall. As the Chattram is held to belong to the temple no such permission can be given unless Rajamma acquiesces in that view and will let him the Chattram & the compound wall together to be considered temple property. As she is not likely to agree. The only course therefore seems to be to refuse permission and evict Rajamma. The first Member (Mr A.R. Srinivasayyan) raised the question how this could be done, and observed that the only provision in the Madras regulations applicable to the case is Sec 10 but that the procedure prescribed in it had not been followed. The L & L. Secretary may perhaps be consulted as to the procedure of law, if any, other than Sec 10 of the new Regn, applicable to the case and the procedure to be followed either under this section or under such other provision of law for evicting the petitioner. For perusal and orders

MD 23/12

2) Secy 62) The Mgr Commrs order is quite correct. - There is no reason to interfere with it. The appeal may be dismissed. Permission to 2nd member build the compound wall 25.12.26
2) agree Mr 29.12.26 maybe refused [illegible] 30/12/26

COUNCIL
22 DEC. 1926
No. 4419

2402
2168 | 2nd Jan 27

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

63) D/R. with Submr.

AM 5/1/27 10/1/27 12/1/27

64) For approval before issue.

2544

9/1/27

12/1/27

65) Issued 19/1

9. To.

Rajamma alias Anadha vanidi. Endt No 1275 dt 19.1.27 informs him that Govt see no reason to interfere with issue on ex order.

No 1276 dt 19.1.27 Copy of the above to Dist Collr

25/1




19

Dno 20

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF

MYSORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. of 24-25.

Appellant:-

Rajanna alias Anantharamiah of -
Muguvala village, Jadigenahalli -
Hobli, Hoskote Taluk.

Under Section 22 of the Muzrai Regulation the appellant abovenamed begs to appeal against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner in No. C.572/22-23 herewith filed on the following grounds:-

1. That the learned Muzrai commissioner has erred in supporting the Deputy Commissioner's order directing the eviction of the appellant.

2. The order of the Government referred to although it holds that the Chatram in question is an institution built by Bhaskariah out of public funds does not warrant the order of eviction by the Deputy Commissioner in as much as an 'institution built by public funds' is not included in the definition of the word Muzrai institution as defined in the Muzrai Regulation. and the order is not the one coming under section 3 of the Muzrai Reg. 4:

3. As the Deputy Commissioner has not got the power to interfere in this Muzrai capacity, the learned Muzrai Commissioner should have set aside the order on the ground that it was unauthorised by the Muzrai Regulation.

4. It is open to the Government even now to reconsider its exparte finding that the Chatram in question was built by public funds because the finding itself is based in two spurious letters said to have been in the writing of Anantharamaiah son of Bhaskaraiah which finding can be at once seen to be erroneous & the Government will kindly examine the specimen letters - of Anantharamaiah produced by the appellant - along with his appeal to the Muzrai Commissioner and the appellant humbly submits that a comparison of the hand-writing will show that the letters which (as) to the ~~influence~~ a subsequent by Government are spurious.

5. The order of the Muzrai Commissioner - confirming the order of the Deputy Commissioner - greatly prejudices the appellant who and his - forefathers have been in possession of and managing the Chatram and there is no justice in depriving him of the Chatram itself when the authorities were asked to give him license to put up the compound wall which is a matter quite extraneous.

The appellant further humbly prays - - that pending this appeal the order of the Deputy Commissioner directing eviction may be held in abeyance.

Bangalore,
~~th June~~ 3rd July 1924.

B. Basavaiah

ಅಅಐ EI T ANNAS ಪಿ-೧೯

Order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

Subject:— Appeal (No. C. 572 of 22-23) of Rajanna alias Anantharamiah of Mugavala village, Jadigenahalli Hobli, Hoskote Taluk (preferred to Government and transferred to this office for disposal) against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, in the matter of his claim to the Chattram building at Muga-vala and also enclosing the Chattram with a Compound wall.

Facts of the Case.

In connection with the erection of a Compound wall to the chattram at Mugavala Hoskote Taluk, situated by the side of the Veerabhadra devaru temple, petitions protesting against such erection were received and the matter was enquired into

into
and the Government found that the land
in question belonged originally to one
Budan Sab that it was acquired by the
local offices and given to Bhaskariah,
father of the appellant for the construction
of a Musafirkhana and that the musafirkhana
was built out of public subscription and
consequently Bhaskhariah's descendants
can have no private rights over the site
and directed the Deputy Commissioner
to take needful action in the matter and
report the result, vide, munzai Secretary's
letter No. 2243/Muz. 94-13-11 dated 4-11-21.
In pursuance of this, the Deputy Com-
-missioner issued instructions to the
Sub Division officer to the effect that
Bhaskariah's son Rajanna should
not be allowed to erect the compound
wall for the chattram in question, that
the chattram management should
be left in the hands of the Dharmadarsis
of the Veerabhadraswami temple and
that Rajanna should at once be
evicted

evicted, if he was in possession. The Sub Division officer Dodballapur asked the Amildar to issue a notice to Rajanna in terms of the order and report the result. The present appeal is against the Deputy Commissioner's order of eviction. The appellant who was present with his counsel on the date of hearing (31-5-24) was heard.

Order No. R. Dis 174 of 23-24 dated 16.6.24.
Pore: two files.

Government having held in Muzrai Secretary's letter No. 2243/Muzf. 94-13-11 dated 4.11.21 that the Chattram is a public institution, it is not open to the Deputy Commissioner or this office to reinvestigate the question of private ownership of the appellant without specific orders of Government.

2. I have no recollection of having made an order as set out in para 4 of the appeal petition and no records are also forthcoming.

3. Before the lower courts can proceed

[illegible]

petitioner to put up a compound wall he has to admit the public nature of the institution as decided by Government, but which he says is not prepared to do.

4. It is open to the Deputy Commissioner to make suitable arrangements concerning the management of the Chattram.

(Signed) K. Chandy

To. Munsif Commissioner

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, returning the record received with his letter No. A.C. 77 8/16-17 dated 17.3.24.

"Copy"

[signature]
for Munsif Commissioner
27/6/24
PSK.

Date of application 2.6.24
Date when copy was ready. 27-6-24
Date of delivery to party 27-6-24
No. of words 425
Amount 0-10-0
Comparing fee 0-1-8 } 0-11-8
Copied by P. Gopinathan
Compared by B. Keshaviengar.




# In the Court of the

To The Government + the Hon'ble the Mul Wazir
& Mysore

OF

Munsif Appeal CASE No. OF 1926-1927

PLAINTIFF — DEFENDANT

Aff. Court
Rajama alias
Anantharamaiah
vs

1. The Aff. Court above named do, by these presents, retain Mr. B. Nanjundaiya, B.A., B.L., Advocate, Chikkapet, Bangalore City, to appear for and conduct the above case on my behalf to judgment.

2. I further empower him to execute any decree or order that may be passed in my behalf, and to receive from court such sums of money as I may be entitled to get, and to grant receipts therefor.

3. I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the acts done by the said advocate in so doing.

Dated 31/7/ 1926

Accepted 31/7/26

Signed before me

Muz 4]

2705

SUBJECT .....

*Diary No. of letter replied to* _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192 .

**Section**

**File No.**

**Serial No.**

No. 52/three

Date of issue 12-7-24

To

The Muz. Comr.

Signed by _____

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for submission of a report with connected records ~~with a report~~ petition regd. no. 20 from Rajanna alias Ananda Ramiah of Mugavur Village

over.

in the Hoskote Taluk
appealing against your
orders in the matter
of enclosing the chattram
building at the place
with a compound wall etc.

I have etc.

D/11/27.

WD/ Rec. Secretary.

BD 10/12/27

*List of enclosures.*

*Copied by*

*Examined by*

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27 7 22

Muz 4]

2705

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to* _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

*, the* *192* .

**Section**

**File No.**

**Serial No.**

No. 57

Date of issue 12-7-24

Signed by [illegible]

To

With ref. to his petition reg. no. 20 of 4th July 1924 appealing against the Muz. Comrs. order in the matter of enclosing with a compound wall, the chaltram building at the place.

over.

Village in the Hoskote Taluk,
Rajanna alias Ramaswamiah
is informed that a
report has been
called for from the
Insp. Genl. on the subject,
and that no stay order
can be issued as
prayed for.

B—o.

11.7.14.

To) The Revenue Secretary.

10/7/14

Copy to the Insp. Genl. 5-7-14
Copied by
Examined by
Genl. in my name.

B—o.

11.7.14.

To) The Revenue Secretary.

List of enclosures.

WID 0563—GPB—2,500—27 7 22

No. C.77 of 24-25 Office of the Mineral Commissioner [illegible]

19041 By: one file

[illegible]

From

[illegible]

Mineral Commissioner [illegible]

[illegible]

GEN. & REV SECRETARIAT
20 OCT 1924
[illegible]

To

[illegible]

18 OCT. 1924

Sir,

Dnoh 50.

Mmz. 3-24-4.

[illegible]

The appeal petition and its enclosures are also herewith ----- submitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Asst. Muzrai Commissioner.

ASR.

Sus No. 3

31

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Sus

File No. 3-24

Seria No. 5

*Diary No. of letter replied to*.....

No. 1332

To Customs file

The Insp. Gen.a

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

*the* *192*

Sir,

Date of issue 19/4/26

Signed by .....

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. C.77 dt 14th Octr 1926 reporting on the appeal-petition of Rajamah ali Marikkar in the matter of the construction of a compound wall to the chavakkadu at Mutur in the Hospital Jaffna I am directed to enquire whether the chavakkadu in question has or is to be

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

of the pets or of the temple authorities when the Dy. Comr passed his order under appeal, and if the pets was in possession of the building, ~~that is the~~ under what provision of law ~~under which~~ his ~~his~~ eviction was ordered by the Dy. Comr. I am also to ~~point out here~~ ~~observe~~ that the only provision of Mysore Reg^n applicable to cases of unauthorized alienation of properties belonging to religious institutions ~~was~~ is Sec. 10 of the Regn, ~~and to state~~ viz that the procedure prescribed in this section does not seem to have been followed in this case. (2) The record sent herewith returned for reference and re-submission as early as possible.

I have etc

10/4 Obd

.4.26

33

No. C 770/24-25 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
Enclosure

Dated Bangalore, 7th May 1926.

From 47250

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.




D 1331

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

Onm 3-246

Sir,

I D/

Adverting to your letter No.1332/muz.C-24-5 dated 19th April 1926 enquiring if the chattram at Mugavala in the Hoskote Taluk was in the possession of Rajanna or of the temple authorities when the Deputy Commissioner passed his order under appeal and if the petitioner was in possession of the building under what provision of law his eviction was ordered by the Deputy Commissioner, I have the honor to state that the Deputy Commissioner in his letter No.C. 8-11c5-25 dated 3-5-1926 reports that the order of eviction was passed in pursuance of Government Order No. 3245/muz.24-14-11 dated 4th November 1921 which negatived the rights of Brahmans over the institution as it was on record that Rajanna had appropriated the chattram building for his own use and that the eviction order appears to have been passed under the rules laid down in Appendix G of the Land Revenue Rules though the case also falls under sec.1 of the Muzrai Regulation.

(Let C be a copy in the file)

The file of papers received with the Deputy Commissioner's letter under reference is resubmitted herewith.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C S Balasundaram Iyer

Muzrai Commissioner.

Ale

34

4pp -

SUBJECT.....

Section mur

File No. 3-24

Seria No.

No. 1484 Agriculture

To The Hon'ble Commr

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Date of issue 22/5/26

Signed by.....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. C. 77 dt 4th May 1926 reporting on the appeal petn of Rajanna alias Mantha regarding the chattram at Mugulala in the Hoskote Taluk, I am directed to observe that in his order dt 23rd Nov 1921, The Hon'ble Commr states that if Rajanna is in possession of the chattram he should at once be evicted & the matter reported to him

WD 0562—GPB—31,000—17-8-25

Sd/- [illegible]

~~and~~ to request to be informed
what the facts were; whether
at the time of this order,
the individual was in possession
and whether he was actually
evicted by the Rev. authorities.
(2) The correspondence leading
to G.O. no. 2243/Mis. 94-14-11
dt 4-11-1921, which was which negatived the rights of Bhaskariah over the
transferred to you for disposal,
~~under cover of~~ in this office letter
no. 1591/Mis. 63-22, dt 24-10-1922,
may be sent up for ref.
also kindly obtained
(3) No Ven. records are
herewith returned for ref. & re-delivered
Carly 7-12- I have etc.

Dy. Rev. Secretary.

15/5/26

No. C. 22/24/25 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated Bangalore, 26th October 1926.

From

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esquire., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

REV. SECRETARIAT. 28-OCT 1926 MUZRAI

To

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Financial Department.

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter No.1484 Muz. 3-24-7 dated 22nd May 1926 calling for further particulars in re the construction of a compound wall to the chattram at ---- Muguvala in the Hoskote Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, in his letter No.C.3-1185-25 dated 20th October 1926, reports that Rajanna alias Anantha --- Ramiah, has all along been in wrongful possession and that eviction proceedings did not make further progress than the service of the notice on the party concerned.

The file of correspondence R.Dis.No.174 of 23-24 dated 16th June 1924 referred to in para 2 of your letter together with the vernacular records, is herewith submitted for kind reference and return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Muzrai Commissioner.

(Absent from station.)

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

37

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Mug

File No. 3-24

Serial No 9

No 1275

*Diary No. of letter replied to*.....

To

.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

*the* 192

Endorsement granted to Rajanna alias Anantanaicki of Mugaseala Village in the Hoskote Taluk, with ref. to his petition no. 20 of 3-7-24 appealing against the Muz. Comr's. order in the matter of the apltt's. claim to the chattram building at mugasela and also enclosing the chattram with a compound wall.

Date of issue 19-1-27

Signed by Mr T. Sengaravelu

Madras

28

P.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by A.V. 18/1/27

That the apltt is informed Govt do not see any reason to interfere with the order of the Muz. Comr

*over*

appeal against is quite correct, and that there is no reason to interfere with it. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

By. Order

k

Dy. Fin. Secretary.

Dy 12/1/27

Copy to the Insp. of Courts, Nellore with his letter No 1276 & 2 files, for information. & return the records received with his letter No. 77 dt 27.10.1926.

19-1-27.

(2.) Permission to build the Compound wall prayed for by the applt, may be refused.

B. O.

k

12/1/27

Dy. Fin. Secretary

I Dy

12.1.27